BACONIANA.

VOL. VIII. *Third Series.* JULY, 1910. No. 31

THE A **A** HEAD-PIECES.

THE remarkable use which, in the latter part of the fifteenth and during the sixteenth centuries, was made by printers of emblematical head-pieces and tail-pieces has frequently been treated of in the pages of BACONIANA,* but attention does not appear to have been drawn to a family of head-pieces in which a light A and a dark **A** form the principal feature. I have searched diligently through many hundreds of books, printed between the years 1560 and 1650, which have passed through my hands during the last few years, with the result that I have found nine variants of the design. In seven of these the same block appears to have been used in various books; in two cases two blocks have been made slightly differing in size.

In drawing attention to this device I do not profess

* See Vol. II., page 317 ("Bacon's Essay of Pan and the Hieroglyphic Tail-piece of Pan"); page 370 ("The New Birth of Time"); Vol. III., page 105 ("Tell-tale Title-pages in the Pan Cipher"); Vol. V., page 77 ("Emblem Pictures in Baconian Books"); Vol. VI., No. 24, page 10 ("Hieroglyphic Symbols and Pictures"); Vol. IX., page 157 ("Emblems from Nature used by Bacon and Shakespeare"); Third Series, Vol. I., pages 6 and 105 ("Hidden Symbols"); Vol. II., page 91 ("The Migration of Woodblocks"); page 197 ("Haviland's Head-piece").

to have arrived at any definite conclusion as to its interpretation or its purpose, but the evidence which will be advanced appears to point to the blocks being the property of one person or Society, and my suggestion is that when an order was given to a printer to set up the type of a book forming one of a certain class it was stipulated that he would be supplied with a block which he was to reproduce on a given page or pages. That nine distinct designs, varying widely in other respects, were used, in all of which the light A and the dark **A** formed the outstanding feature, justifies the assumption that it had a special significance. Was this significance of general knowledge amongst printers and readers or was it an earmarking device used by one person or one Society? If the evidence to be put forward justifies, if not a definite answer to this question, at least the formation of a reasonable conclusion on the point, it may be hoped that students of the literature of the period may contribute to these columns any data that may fall in their way to assist in the elucidation of the subject.

In MDCXVI was published "Les Emblemes Moraulx et Militaires Du Sieur Jacob De Bruck Angermundt Nouvellement mis en Lumiere A Strasbourg, Par Jacob de Heyden Graveur."

In Emblem No. 18, now reproduced, the light A and the dark **A** will be found in the branch of the tree which the man is about to cut off. (Figure I.)

Another Emblem does not contain the light A and dark **A**, but it contains the bark of the trunk and branches of the tree, the strong contrast between the dark and light, which feature is usually represented in most of the title-pages of books in which this device is found. (Figure II.)

Camden in his "Remaines Concerning Britaine," 1614, commences a chapter on "Impreses," at the head

of which the device is found, thus: "An Imprese (as the Italians call it) is a device in picture with his Motte, or Word, borne by noble and learned personages, to notifie some particular conceit of their owne: as Emblemes (that we may omitte other differeces) doe propound some general instructions to all." Then follow a number of examples and amongst them this:—

"Variete and vicissitude of humane things he seemed to shew, which parted his shield, *Per Pale, Argent & Sables* and counterchangeably writte in the Argent, ATER and in the Sables ALBUS."

But even if the light A and dark **A** are used in the design of the head-piece to represent Albus and Ater it does not afford any satisfactory explanation as to why they are so used.

Another and more satisfactory interpretation is that the device is intended to convey the impression that the book contains that which is overt and that which is concealed, or that there is in connection with its origin or publication some facts which are not revealed.

In the light of present information it is useless to pursue these conjectures further. It is a reasonable presumption that these devices were designed with a purpose and were not used indiscriminately according to the caprice of the printer.

One other fact in connection with the use of these devices may be mentioned. In nearly every case the book in which they appear contains lines addressed "To the Reader," either without a signature or in some case with initials which cannot be identified with any name connected with the authorship, translation or publication of the work. These proems are similar in language, in literary style, and in peculiarities of construction.

Here then is my theory for what it is worth. There

was at the close of the sixteenth century some man (possibly it was a secret society, but the supposition of it being one man is preferable) who held that it was desirable that certain classical and foreign works should be translated into the English language, and he caused translations to be made. He recognised that on certain subjects there was a lack of information, so he caused books to be written on these subjects. He was a versatile writer himself—a poet, too—and his pen was incessantly producing works as the author of which he preferred to remain unknown. He superintended the printing and production of all these books. To those which did not directly proceed from his pen he wrote a foreword addressed "To the Reader." But in all these works he placed his sign-manual, and for this he used an emblematic device containing the light A and the dark **A**.

Before proceeding to give fac-similes of these headpieces it may be well to make it clear that in the sixteenth century there was no method of duplicating blocks. There appeared in BACONIANA an article by Mr. Harold Bayley on Migration of Woodblocks.* This article before publication was submitted to Mr. Charles T. Jacobi, of the Chiswick Press, London, who is the author of "Books and Printing" (London, 1902), and several works on typography. He says :—

> It is a well-known fact to Bibliographers that the same blocks were sometimes used by different printers in two places quite far apart, and at various intervals during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. That the same blocks were employed is apparent from a comparison of technical defects of impressions taken at different places, and at two periods. There was no method of duplication in existence until stereotyping was first invented in 1725 ; even then the details were somewhat crude, and the process being new, it met with much opposition and

* BACONIANA, Third Series, Vol. II., page 91.

was practically not adopted until the early part of the nineteenth century. Electrotyping, which is the ideal method of reproducing woodblocks, was not introduced until 1836 or thereabouts. Of course, it was quite possible to re-engrave the same design, but absolute fidelity could not be relied on by these means, even if executed by the same hand.

The impressions here reproduced have all been examined in the books in which they are stated to be found by a very capable expert in wood engraving, and without hesitation he affirms that, except where otherwise stated, they are printed from the same block.

The earliest date at which I have been able to find the head-piece is 1563, in "De Furtivis Literarum Notis Vulgo. De *Ziferis*," Ioan. Baptista Porta Neapolitano Authore. Cum Privilegio Neapoli, apud Ioa. Mariam Scotum. MDLXIII. (Figure III.)

It is used only once—over the dedication Ioanni Soto Philippi Regis. There is no other head-piece in the book. John Baptist Porta was, with the exception of Trithemius, whom he quotes, the first writer on cypher. At the time at which he wrote cypher-writing was studied in every court in Europe. It is significant that this emblematic device is used in the earliest period in which head-pieces were adopted, in a book which is descriptive and is in fact a text book of the art of concealment. I cannot find any impressions from this particular block elsewhere, but the exact design appears in our literature in 1590.

The earliest English printed book in which I have been able to find the light A and the dark **A** is "The Arte of English Poesie," printed by Richard Field and bearing date 1589. Information as to the authorship and contents thereof have appeared in BACONIANA and elsewhere from the pens of Mr. Parker Woodward and the late Rev. Walter Begley.* The title-page bears the

* BACONIANA, Third Series, Vol. III., page 95. Bacon's "Nova Resuscitatio," by Rev. Walter Begley, Vol. I.

familiar "Anchora Spei" emblem. On the next page is a dedication signed by Richard Field to Lord Burgley, which commences thus :—

This Booke (right Honourable comming to my handes, with his bare title without any Author's name or any other ordinarie addresse, I doubted how well it might become me to make you a present thereof, seeming by many express passages in the same at large, that it was by the Authour intended to our Soveraigne Lady the Queene and for her recreation and service chiefly devised.

Over this dedication is a design, 4 in. × 10-12ths, much more elaborate than that in Baptista Porta, which is reproduced. (Figure IV.)

In 1591 was published a translation by Sir John Harington in English heroical verse of "Orlando Furioso," imprinted at London by Richard Field for John Norton and Simon Waterson. In this volume the light A and the dark **A** appear no less than 96 times in 24 groups of 4 each.

It is stated that Harington translated the episode of Alcina and Ruggiero from the "Orlando Furioso," but the queen deeming it proper to be offended at the licentiousness of the tale strangely enough imposed as a remedy the translation of the whole epic, a task which he is said to have performed with the help of his brother Francis. Prefixed thereto is "A Preface, or rather a briefe apologie of Poetrie, and of the Author and Translator of this Poeme." This is unsigned. In it occurs the following, being the first known reference to "The Arte of English Poesie" :—

"Neither do I suppose to be greatly behovefull for this purpose to trouble you with the curious definitions of a Poet and Poesie, and with the subtill distinctions of their sundrie kinds, nor to dispute how high and supernaturall the name of a Maker is, so christened in

English by that unknowne Godfather, that this last yeare save one, viz., 1589, set forth a booke, called The Arte of English Poetrie."

The work is divided into 46 books. At the head of each, set in a frame, is *The Argument.* The frames of 24 of these books are composed of designs of the light **A** and dark **A**. The design as it appears over *The First Booke or Canto* is reproduced. (Figure V.)

The block at the bottom is the identical one which was used in "The Arte of English Poesie." A second block has been engraved and is used at the top of the frame. On either side is a new device, 3 5-12ths ins. × 7-12th ins. (Figure VI.)

The same arrangement is observed in the second edition printed by Richard Field in 1607. Here on the first impression the old block shows signs of a crack across the figure to the right of the centre. This defect gradually increases as its use proceeds, until over the 46th Book there is a clear break of 1-18th in.

The device on either side (Figure VI.) is reproduced in the first edition of Spencer's "Faerie Queen," printed by William Ponsonby in 1596. It is also in "How to Chuse, Ride, Trayne and Dyet, both Hunting Horses and Running Horses," by Gervase Markham, printed by E. A. for E. White, 1606.

In the first collected edition of Ben Jonson's work, 1616—1640, the same design as in "The Arte of English Poesie" will be found; the printer is W. Stansby.

In 1579 was published "An Arithmetical Militare Treatise named Stratioticos: compendiously teaching the science of Nūbers as well in fractions as integers, and so much of the Rules and Æquations, Algebricall and Arte of Numbers Cossicall as are requisite for the profession of a soldier, &c. Long since attēpted by Leonard Digges, gent. Augmented, digested, and lately finished by Thomas Digges, gent. It was printed by Henrie

Bynneman, dwelling in Thames Street, neere unto Baynard's Castle, at London, A.D. 1579." There is an unsigned proem "To the Reader."

Leonard Digges was a most excellent mathematician, a skilful architect and a most expert surveyor of land.* Two small treatises were published by him during his lifetime, viz., "Tectonian" (1556) and "Prognostication Everlasting, of right good effect" (1555). These were augmented and re-published by his son, Thomas Digges, in 1592 and 1591 respectively. He also in 1590 republished his father's "Stratioticos," which was imprinted by Richard Field at London. This contains an impression of the Anchora Spei device from the same block used in Harington's "Orlando Furioso." According to Anthony Wood, Thomas Digges was highly skilled in the most difficult and curious demonstrations mathematical and was much esteemed by John Dee, Thomas Allen and others.†

In the 1590 edition of "Stratioticos," printed by Richard Field, two appendices are added, and, so far as I can trace, for the first time the emblematic head-piece, found in John Baptist Porta's cypher book of 1563, is reproduced. The impression is from a new block, and is placed at the commencement of each appendix. (Figure III.) The design has been closely followed as to size and detail, but there are several minute differences which prove that it has been re-engraved.

In 1593 this identical block is used once in printing "A Plaine Discovery of the whole Revelation of Saint John, set foorth by John Napier L., of Marchistoun, younger. This book was printed in Edinburgh by Robert Waldegrave, Printer to the King's Majestie."

In 1595 it is over the dedication to William Earle, of

* "Athenæ Oxoniensis" (1813), Vol. I., page 414.

† *Ibid*, page 636, or if on another page; "Athenæ Oxoniensis" (1813), Vol. I., page 636.

Darbie, signed by Thomas Lodge, in "A Fig for Momus," printed for Clement Knight at London.

In 1595 the same design, but engraved on another block differing in size, is used as a tail-piece after the proeme of the author in the translation of "The Florentine Histoire," by Macchiavelli, hereafter referred to. The same block is found over characters added to The Wife, now the Widow, of Sir Thomas Overbury. Printed in 1614 by T. C.

In 1603 the "Stratioticos" block is used in the dedication unto the Rev. and Hon. Lord Michele de Sylva of "The Courtier of Counti Baldessar Castilio," translated into English by Thos. Hobby and printed by T. Creede.

In the same year the identical block showing signs of wear is on the title-page and over the third book of Dæmonologie, in forme of a dialogue written by James I., printed for William Cotton and Will Aspley at London. There is another variety of the device in this book.

In 1611 it will be found on pages 697, 760 and 780 of Joshua Sylvester's translation of the works of Salusti de Barto, printed by Humphrey Lownes.

In 1609 it is again used once only over verses To the young gentleman Readers in Five Bookes of Philosophicall Comefort by Bœtius.* On this occasion the book is printed by John Windet for Mathew Lownes.

In 1609 W. Hale prints for Thomas Adams "The Summe of the Conference between John Rainholdes and John Hart touching the Head of the Faith of the Church," and over the dedication to the Earle of Leicester is the same design.

In 1610 it is the only Imprese in "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church," by Thos. Bilson,

* Spedding says that Elizabeth is supposed to have translated the "Deconsolatione" of Bœtius to console herself after the news of the French King's apostasy ("Life and Letters," Vol. I., page 255).

Warden of Winchester College, printed for Thomas Adams.

In 1614 John Legatt, printing for Simon Waterson "Remaines Concerning Britain," by Camden, inserts the device from the identical block eight times, and on page 106 over "Surnames" it is printed upside down.

In 1615 it is found in two books by Richard Braithwaite, both "printed by I. B. for Richard Redmer, and are to be sold at the West dore of Paul's at the Starre," viz., "A Strappado for the Devill," in which it occurs four times and "Love's Labrynith or The True Lover's Knot," in which it is twice produced.

In the same year it is used in "The English Housewife," by Gervase Markham, printed by John Beale for Roger Jackson and repeated in the 1637 edition.

In 1621 it figures over the dedications of the first and second parts of "Nature's Embassie: or the Wilde-man's Measures," by R. Braithwaite, and in the same year over the commencement of the second part of "The Shepherd's Tales." Both works are printed for Richard Whitaker and have on their title-page the Anchora Spei device.

In 1625 it is used once in "Geography Delineated Forth," in two books by Nathaniel Carpenter, fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. This book is printed for Henry Cripps at Oxford by John Lichfield and William Trune, Printers for the famous University.

It is also found in the 1639 and 1642 editions of Bacon's Essays, printed by John Beale.

Taking up the threads again, in 1593 *Venus and Adonis* makes its appearance, "imprinted by Richard Field, and are to be sold at the signe of the White Greyhound in Paules Church-yard."

Over the celebrated dedication to the Earle of Southampton is the design used on the sides of the frames in "Orlando Furioso."

On the title-page and also on the title-page and first verse of *Lucrece* is an emblematic device, which will be referred to hereafter as associated with the same design as that which appears over the dedication to Lord Burleigh in "The Arte of English Poesie." (Figure VIII.)* Both *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece* have on the title-page the Anchora Spei device, but printed from different blocks.

In 1595 was published "The Florentine Historie," written in the Italian Tongue by Nicholo Macchiavelli and translated into English by T. B., Esq., London. Printed by T. C. for W. P. The frontispiece is from the well-known block which appeared subsequently in the first folio edition (1609) of the "Færie Queen." Over the first book of the Florentine History is a device very similar to that in "The Arte of English Poesie." (Figure VIII.) This was reproduced on page 413 of the second edition (1636) of Kingswell Long's translation of Barclay's "Argenis."

Shake-speare's Sonnets, never before imprinted, bear date 1609. At the foot are the words: "At London By G. Eld for T. T. and are to be solde by William Apsley." Over the first Sonnet is a device now reproduced, which does not appear to have been used elsewhere. The design is very similar to, though not identical with, the Baptista Porta, 1563, emblem. (Figure IX.) Underneath the centre ornament will be seen a key. "With this same key Shakespeare unlocked"—what? It will be observed that in this as in every other design the inner sides of the two A's are drawn to represent the letter C.

In 1611 was published the first folio edition of the Authorised Version of the Bible, with a device also found in the first folio 1623 edition of the Shakespeare plays.

* This is a reproduction of the reproduction of the design contained in the Clarendon Press, 1905, fac-simile.

In 1612 the first quarto edition of the Scriptures appeared. The title-page of the Genealogies is now reproduced. (Figure X.) The design at the head of the page is apparently in every detail identical with the head-piece used in the first quarto edition of *Venus and Adonis*, 1593, and *Lucrece*, 1594, whilst that on the lower half of the title-page is the same as that found over the dedication in "The Arte of English Poesie," 1589, although a new block has been engraved.

All these works were printed by Richard Field, whereas the Authorised Version of the Bible was produced by Robert Barker, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majestie. How did it come about that, when devices had to be provided for the adornment of the most important book of the century, this remarkable selection was made? It was certainly paying a very great compliment to the authors of "The Arte of English Poseie" and "Venus and Adonis" thus to associate their productions with this monumental work. Did the King or the Bishops make the selection? Such an important matter would surely not be left to the printer.

The design (Figure XI.) was, so far as I can trace, first used in a book printed by Adam Islip in 1602. It is styled "A Discourse upon the Meanes of wel governing and maintaining in good peace, a Kingdome or other Principalitie. Against Nicholas Machiavel, the Florentine. Translated into English by Simon Patericke." The author's name is not stated, but it is attributed to a French lawyer, named I. Gentillet, an adherent of the Reformation, who died at Geneva about 1595. The dedication is to Francis Hastings and Edward Bacon, and is well worthy of careful consideration. The device is used six times in the book.

In 1621 it appears sixteen times in "A learned summary upon the famous Poeme of William of Saluste,

Lord of Bartes. Translated out of French by T.L.D.M.P. Printed in London for John Grismand and sold at his Shoppe in Paules Alley at the signe of the Gunne."

In 1625 it will be seen in "The True and Royal History of the famous Empresse Elizabeth." Darcie's translation from the French edition, which contains in the early pages some extraordinary proems. It is stated to be printed for Benjamin Fisher, to be sold at the Talbot, Pater Noster Row. The device is therein used ten times.

In the same year, 1625, it appears in "Barclay, His Argenis, printed by G. P. for Henry Seile." It is twice used in this book, which purports to be a translation from the Latin, first published in Paris in 1621.

It also appears once in the second edition (1636) of this translation of the Argenis printed for Henry Seile. There is in this book, on page 413, another design of the light A and dark **A**, as in the Florentine History, 1595. (Figure VIII.)

"The Mirrour of State and Eloquence" is a book remarkable for the dogrel lines which are placed under a portrait of Bacon, which is a very bad imitation of the Marshall portrait prefixed to the 1640 Gilbert Wat "Advancement of Learning." The copy I have is dated 1656. Printed for Lawrence Chapman. The design is over the heading *Bacon's* Remains on the page bearing the printer's signature B.

What at first sight appears to be a much more elaborate design (Figure XII.) engraved for large folios will be found on four pages in Lodge's translation of "Seneca," printed by William Stansby in 1614. On a close inspection it will be found to consist of two blocks of the Baptista Porta (1563) design, with the opposite ends cut off and joined together so that the centre represents the letter X.

In 1616 the same printer makes use of the identical block in a book entitled "The Surveyor." It will be seen on page 175 at the commencement of the fourth book.

In the First Folio Edition of the Shakespeare Plays, 1623, the lines to which the name of Henry Holland are attached are surmounted by a design containing the light A and the dark **A** (see Figure VII). This is similar to that in "The Arte of English Poesie," except that a sheaf of corn has been substituted for the bowl of flowers in the centre, and a scroll has been added at either end to make the size suitable for a folio page instead of a quarto. (Figure XIII.) The page containing the names of the actors prefixed to the play of *Henry V.* also has this design at the top. Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount were the printers. This same design is over the commencement of Edward Topsell's "History of Serpents," printed by W. Jaggard in 1608. The centre of the design without the scroll at either end but from a different block is found over the Preface to the Reader in Dæmonologie, 1603, before referred to. (Figure XIV.)

There are no doubt many more books in which these blocks have been used, but the point to be determined is the exact dates when they were first introduced and when they cease to be found.

I would ask any readers of BACONIANA to look through books of the period which they may have in their possession, and if any variant of the design can be found in a book not before enumerated to advise me of the fact. If space can be found in the next number I propose to advance some arguments in favour of the theory which I have ventured to suggest.

Y. LEDSEM.

BACON'S ADVENTURE SHIP.

ON the frontispiece of the "Novum Organum" is depicted a ship in full sail passing out into the wide ocean through columns emblematical of the ancient pillars of Hercules.

The galleon is high in the water, signifying that it had yet to obtain its cargo.

It sails out towards us as coming out of the book, typifying that by means of the teaching of the book its cargo will be obtained.

Now what is this teaching? Bacon explained in a letter to King James that it was "a new logic teaching to invent and judge by deduction." Kuno Fischer, in his masterly exposition of Bacon's inductive method, explains that Baconian induction proceeds from experiment to axiom—Baconian deduction from axiom to experiment, the former being the method of interpretation, the latter that of application. The former ends with the discovery of law, the latter with an invention.

Bacon shows how pure experience proceeds from doubt or the destruction of idols.

The ship is emblematic of his great device for recovering the fame due to him as author of a large body of vizarded works, for informing the next ages who he was, detailing his life history and concurrently proving the value of the inductive method of reasoning.

He doubtless anticipated, without fear as to the ultimate success of his project, that, worked upon Aristotelian principles, his countrymen would be subjected to lives of Marlowe, of Spenser, of Peele, of Burton, of Greene, of Shakspere, and of his other vizards in which the biographers, starting with the ascriptive theory of authorship, would add to their few available facts all manner of assumptions and notions more or less plausible.

Bacon seems, moreover, to have had another object in mind. He had sought in his plays and poems to act the part of the schoolmaster in the manner of Orpheus of ancient mythology.

From a manuscript addressed "Ad Filios" two considerations have been permitted to emerge, namely, that he desired not present but posthumous fame, and had planned and set in operation a system of teaching wherein he played the nurse both with his own thoughts and those of others. The late Judge Stotsenburg asked, "Was there in England a concealed poet who wrote or revised the plays (of Shakespeare) in part or all, or who inserted in all or part of them the magnificent and sparkling gems culled and gathered from art, from nature, from history, from philosophy, from science, and from ancient lore?" The answer is "Yes."

For the safe success of such an enterprise the teaching philosopher had to keep concealed while his lessons were being gently insinuated and allowed to sink into the minds of his auditors and readers.

Once the schoolmaster was disclosed, man's natural resentment of didatic teaching would have arisen, and the resulting profit from the teaching would have been small.

But what was there to prevent Bacon from leaving sealed instructions with, say, the Royal Society or the authorities of some college or institution likely to exist for many years then yet to come, endorsed with directions to open them a hundred years thence, whereby his claim and the documentary proof of it could then be revealed? What operated to prevent his friend and fellow-worker Ben Jonson or his devoted chaplain Rawley from making a long-postponed announcement of the great achievements of the dead master?

On the other hand, let us assume that Bacon took his intimate friends and fellow-workers into counsel and

said to them, "It is my wish that the facts of my life and of my vizarded or concealed authorship shall be left to be proved inductively by future investigators who, I anticipate, will first collect the material facts and then eliminate by honest doubt those non-essential or contingent; the residue of the data will sooner or later consist of the essential and true."

"I Francis Bacon will leave this problem to future ages believing as I do that in process of time and by the very method of inductive reasoning which I hold to be essential to all true conclusions, it will be solved and concurrently the supreme value of my inductive method justified." Bacon's intimates, privy to the preparation and launching of this great world-wide experiment, and under the spell of his marvellous influence, would not for one moment have ventured to interfere with the fruition of the great master's plan.

Men have boldly faced death rather than divulge less important secrets than his were. Moreover, they were parties to the scheme. The adventure ship sailing out into the wide ocean of the unknown future was theirs as well. They had sawn wood and hammered rivets for it.

> "And now I will unclasp a secret book,
> And to your quick conceiving discontents."
> "I'll read you matter deep and dangerous
> As full of courage and adventurous spirit
> As to oerwalk a current roaring wide
> Upon the unsteadfast footing of a speare."

Thus was the good ship sent upon its adventurous career into the unknown sea of time.

Rawley had not the same buoyant confidence in the future as his master.

In a certain deciphered passage he remarked:—

"It seemes to us a thought most imprudent, but not

to his lordship who hath soe confident regard to the time none knowes, hee doth not take note of present time." (*From a recent decipher by Mrs. Gallup.*)

After a long interregnum until England and the civilised world had settled down to peacefulness, the poems and plays renewed their educative course. Learned men began to appreciate their beauty, to absorb their philosophic teaching and to be influenced by their great charm.

As the cordial applause of a successful new play is often followed by a demand for the appearance of its author before the footlights, so did the world seek to learn more about the authors of these Elizabethan plays and poems, and particularly about the personality of the author called "Shakespeare."

In this manner commenced the preliminary inductive survey leading to doubt and to the elimination of the non-essential, which Bacon expected.

Facts collected with the most reverential care concerning the Stratfordian player resulted in a blank. That there lived once at Stratford an actor of similar name who, having become wealthy by sharing theatre entrance money with other players, had retired and sold malt in his native village was certain, but the collected particulars of his life told against rather than for his ascribed authorship.

"I cannot marry this fact to his verse," remarked the perplexed Emerson. Doubts arose in the minds of others. Halliwell Phillip's long researches and biographical attempts at a Life of Shakespeare really boiled down to the details that a player named Shakspere was baptised in 1564, married, had children, commenced actor about 1594, retired to Stratford-on-Avon with his profit-sharing gains, and died in 1616, leaving an elaborate will containing no reference to authorship or books or manuscripts of any kind, while

such local traditions as existed concerning him were unfavourable to the authorship assumption.

More modern delvings, showing that he once sold an impresa to the Earl of Rutland, which Burbage was paid for re-painting, and that he once lodged with a hairdresser (I think that was the trade) only serve further to eliminate the non-essential.

The discrepancies between the Stratford bust and Dugdale's engraving of its predecessor, and the remarkable anomalies of the Droeshout engraving in the First Folio, confirmed the doubters' attitude toward the authorship ascription.

Alongside the eliminating process inductive reasoning pointed firmly to another solution. Observers here and there, working quite sporadically, began to detect close similarities between the ideas and expressions of the Shakespeare plays and poems and the ideas and expressions in Bacon's acknowledged works and correspondence. Some of them had the temerity to express themselves openly upon the subject and eventually formed a society in support of their view.

The main body of English and foreign men of literature was genuine in its resentment of the doubts concerning England's chief poet, whom they had identified as at one with the Stratford actor. Had not Ben Jonson in the 1623 Folio settled this question for all time?

They hit back sharply, effectually quieting such good doubters as nevertheless preferred peace and conformity to public satire and abuse. But, as Bacon once remarked under his "Nash" vizard, "Contention is a coale the more it is blowne by a dysputation the more it kindleth." So controversy and abuse hardened others who were well assured of Bacon's association with the works called Shakespeare. They kept in the field and began to rake it thoroughly for further evidence in support

of their contention. There is reason to believe that Bacon prepared for this development. In his pamphlet concerning Essex he affirmed that though not professing to be a poet he had on an occasion writ a sonnet for an important purpose. Despite, too, a most vigilant revision and suppression of his manuscripts, commonplace books, scrap writings, and letters and the dispersion of his library, a draft in his handwriting of an important letter to Sir John Davis was permitted to escape destruction, in which letter in an occult way Bacon alluded to himself as a concealed poet. In 1624 he took another important step by publishing a verse translation made by him of seven of the Psalms. About the same date he dictated a considerable collection of humorous stories entitled "Apophthegms." These latter were entrusted to Rawley to publish later.

Did he not in these ways plan further chains of inductive reasoning? Mr. Sidney Lee, who appears to be left as principal champion of the Aristotelian theory of Shakespeare authorship, and who has taken the Stratfordian "holy places" under his especial charge, pontifically disposes of any claim for Bacon, grounded upon his Psalm versifications, as follows:—

"While such authentic examples of Bacon's effort to write verse, as survive, prove beyond all possibility of contradiction that great as he was as a prose writer and philosopher, he was incapable of penning any of the poetry assigned to Shakespeare" (Lee's "Life of Shakespeare").

If Mr. Lee be right one of the chains of induction would fail and prove that Bacon's plan in this respect was faulty. Mr. Lee's allegation, therefore, must here be examined. In the first place Bacon had, towards the close of his life, centred his activities on very exacting prose compositions, and at the age of 64 was not at his best for writing poetry. Secondly, he was ill; the

versifications, as stated in his dedication, were a recreation of his sickness. Thirdly, they were written under two important limitations, namely, the limitation of scope which always hampers a translator and the limitation of poetic expression involved by the sacred character of the subject matter. These limitations were far more fatal to the poetic reputation of Milton when he in his day essayed to versify Psalms. Both Bacon and Milton (as Mr. Hookham observes, *National Review*, September, 1909) reverentially as men of great devoutness confined themselves closely to the written word of the sacred Psalmist. Yet Mr. Hookham could say of Bacon's versifications of Psalm 137 that they were good poetry and great poetry, that they had the volume and full tone that only come of weight and mass and possessed the rarest qualities of poetry because they required much more than mere poetic gift for their production. Even Mr. Spedding, quoting part of Bacon's translation of the 90th Psalm, was satisfied that he had "a fine ear for metre, a fine feeling for imaginative effect in words, and a vein of poetic passion."

Mr. Lee's contention had the powerful support of the late Mr. Churton Collins and other critics. Did either of these two learned gentlemen ever produce poetry of their own, and with that confident familiarity which Bacon evidenced in his dedication to George Herbert: "I thought that in respect of divinity and poesy met (whereof the one is the matter, the other the style of this little writing) I could not make better choice"? So poesy was with Bacon a mere style of writing.

Elsewhere we can find him remarking, "Style is as the subject-matter."

Good Stratfordian critic, "Pause and ask thyself the question, Canst thou do likewise?" If not, then

in the words of the epitaph in "The Mystery of Edwin Drood," "with a blush retire."

The parallelisms between "this little writing" and the writings title-paged to Shakespere are numerous, but to such indications Shakesperians ever turn a deaf ear:

> "There's not the smallest orb that thou beholdest
> But in its motion like an angel sings
> Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubims."

You may not hear it just as you may not by reason of your obsessions be open to recognise poetry from the hand of Francis Bacon. Leave it to others. That great poet Shelley, after reading Bacon's acknowledged writings, could put them down and say "Lord Bacon was a poet," and could then proceed to justify his opinion at considerable length.

Another man of great literary culture, Bulwer Lytton, could write of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," "Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes."

In planning this particular chain of reasoning as part of his inductive process Bacon could not do more than obscurely hint at and give moderate indication of his qualifications as a poet. More than this would have defeated his plan. The opinions of Shelley and Bulwer Lytton on the general proposition of Bacon's poetical qualifications and those of Mr. Hookham and Mr. Spedding on the particular instance of the Psalm versifications are a sufficient reply to the asseverations of Mr. Lee and others, whose bias and commitments to the Stratfordian view render them of doubtful usefulness as expert witnesses.

The chain accordingly remains strong.

Of the value of parallelisms as another inductive chain, a large number of enquirers of the present day are assured, and, I think, rightly so. Their value as

evidence consists in their enormous number. Had it not been for the powerful prepossessions of the public mind concerning the Stratford assumption, this form of evidence would have been accepted as proving Bacon's authorship long ago.

That Bacon had great faith in the inductive force of parallelisms is shown in the following deciphered sentence:

"Use of the same idea or conceit in works that appear wholly different uniteth all, as oft made obvious in bondes revealing relationship. If found surelie time doth shew a designe therein."

Another precautionary measure which seems to have been taken by Bacon was (as I have already indicated) to anticipate and counter the objection that he was by his admitted writings shown to have been too grave a person to have penned the light comedy and broad fooleries to be found in the plays of the Shakespeare Folio and in other of his vizarded publications.

The printing of the considerable number of funny stories called apophthegms, combined with Ben Jonson's memoir referring to Bacon's manner when "he could spare or pass by a jest," are sufficient indication that he was mirthful by nature.

"Poor Mathilde" (said Heine in his sick-room),
"I have been unconscionably long a-dying."

The same may be said of the Shakspere authorship myth. But, once a real search on inductive lines was set on foot, reasoning pointed inexorably to Bacon as the concealed author. The philosophy in the plays is the philosophy exhibited in his acknowledged writings. The law in the plays and poems forms another chain of inductive proof. Bacon was the greatest lawyer of his time, and the plays and

poems are saturated with law—the law of a great lawyer skilled in the theory and practice of the courts, in the law of conveyancing of real property, and in law applicable to matters of State importance.

Inductive collection and reasoning have shown that the writer of the plays was, like Bacon, an aristocrat, who nevertheless had a large-hearted sympathy for the multitude, ignorant and unpleasant as he found them to be. Like Bacon, the author was a free-thinking Episcopalian, who fought for the supremacy of the English Established Church and against schism, yet withal was tempered with a scientific spirit and tolerant to Catholics.

The late Mr. Donnelly and other critics have demonstrated that Bacon and the author of the Shakespeare plays pursued the same extensive classical and other studies, read the same books, possessed the same tastes, enjoyed the same opinions, employed the same unusual words, coined new words, cited the same quotations, and fell into the same errors.

Bacon and "Shakespeare" were fluent in Latin, conversant with Greek, colloquial in French, Italian, and Spanish, skilled in the best English and in many of its dialects. "Both" had studied medicine, surgery, geology, astronomy, history, folk-lore, and the art of poesy.

Bacon and his friends anticipated that in the natural process of time the collection of facts and consequent criticism would throw grave doubt upon the Shakespeare myth, and raise up a strong group of careful reasoning men and women, satisfied that Bacon was the writer concealed behind the Shakespeare mask.

Still this was only a rest bungalow on the road to the truth. A great many Baconians have not yet left its hospitable shelter. It is a comfortable place, and

the road onwards is full of pitfalls and passes through villages of angry men and women—not dangerous certainly, but capable of being very unpleasant.

Inductive assurance is pleasant and somewhat enervating. If all Bacon's supporters had stopped there, his world plan would have failed. A small group of them, however, went on. They reasoned that if Bacon wrote the plays he doubtless prepared a series of exact proofs corroborating each other, and together constituting his acroamatic method of delivery (publication).

This has been found to be the case. The proofs take the form of anagrams, acrostics, emblems, cleverly-devised signatures, figure and letter equivalents and ciphers of various kinds. The solution of these acroamatic proofs calls for laborious experiment and continued concentration.

Bacon says in his "De Augmentis" that "there are three properties required in ciphers—that they be handy, not too laborious to write, reliable, and in no way open to deciphering, and that they be if possible clear of suspicion. The symbols are arbitrary as to selection; the rules are arbitrary, but, once arranged, the symbols and rules are fixed in use."

There is danger of self-delusion. Mr. Donnelly's essay in deciphering, for instance, was not a success. His arithmetical cipher was much too laborious ever to have been written, and the story evolved has so many points of disagreement with more recent deciphered stories and so many opportunities of error that it was not difficult for a first-class mathematical scholar like Dr. Nicholson to demonstrate that Mr. Donnelly had misled himself by his own preconceptions.

The word-cipher discovered by Dr. Owen has all the elements of exactitude. The account of that gentleman's patient research shows the inductive process at its best, and is a romance of persistent experiment until

the cipher was mastered. Most people enter by the ground floor. Metaphorically, Dr. Owen climbed up to, and got in by, the attic window.

Dr. Owen's advisers were possibly responsible for the inconclusive way in which the word-cipher was thrust before the notice of a reluctant public.

Proof ought to be cogent and the evidence promptly available. At an early stage certain translations of Homer's "Illiad" were found to be linked together in the word-cipher.

The sensible thing to have done would have been to have given the Illiad translation with exact references to the lines in Bacon's own and in the vizarded works from which they had been taken. Let us hope this will soon be supplied.

Mrs. Gallup's decipher of like facts to those told in the word-cipher story which she found in the bi-literal cipher invented by Bacon in 1578 is a corroborating chain of proof.

Here again acceptance of the *bona-fides* of this decipher was hampered by the hesitation of the decipherer or her friends to divulge at once the whole method of its deciphering. The work in both ciphers is of too exhaustive a character for other persons to step in and take away the benefits to be derived from unravelling the various narrations, poems and other matters placed in these ciphers.

That Bacon intended the bi-literal cipher and word-cipher to form collateral chains of inductive proof is confirmed by his own words in a recent decipher:

"The purpose of a biliterall cypher (of which I have made use many long years covertly) was that secret history, such as I have given in the present interiour writing, might by th' assistance of these rules be related fully—a most important Word Cyp're being employed soe to do. If I with two such scarcelie seen ciphers

relate the same interior stories, this is the same as it might bee should two make oath secretly in some great cause whereon great matters hang, and so great measures guard in impenetrable dungeons th' chiefe witnesses."

Other decipherers of great ability are engaged upon the solution of other ciphers which Bacon devised as so many more collateral proofs of his claim. Cipher systems only open out step by step to the plodding student; but the student has ever to plod, persist, experiment, and always bear in mind Bacon's aphorism, "He who makes not distinction in small things makes error in great ones."

Decipherers are a hardly used people. Absorbed, dominated, worn by their intensely difficult and widely-differing inductive work, it is not surprising that they are not always the aptest demonstrators. Perhaps Bacon has supplied a reason:

> "And almost thence my nature is subdued,
> To what it works in like the dyer's hand."
>
> "Sonnets" CXI.

Nor is it very remarkable that here and there one decipherer may be sceptical about another's work. Each has to tell the same story in other ways as part of the plan of accumulative proof schemed to exclude the possibility of error or deceit.

In these ways Bacon devised the revelation and proof of his life-story to the next ages, and the triumphant vindication of the value of his inductive method. He may even have hidden and planned for the discovery and recovery of his manuscripts, but in this respect he had to encounter the uncertain ravages of nature and time, and it had been folly to trust only to that, though the best form of proof.

Bacon's silence, the silence of his confidants—Ben Jonson and William Rawley—the silence of all others

in the secret, may thus be accounted for by Bacon's trust in the working of his inductive method.

He and they had faith that the "new logic teaching to invent and judge by induction" would slowly but surely bring its Titan rays to bear upon his true history and achievements, whilst contemporaneously the force and value of inductive methods of reasoning would by this marvellous device be substantiated and illustrated.

The ship, which so long ago started upon its adventurous voyage, may now be descried at the horizon of the calm, sunlit sea, ladened with valuable cargo and slowly winning its way to harbour.

PARKER WOODWARD.

GERMAN DISCUSSION OF THE BACONIAN HYPOTHESIS.

[The following paper continues the report of a discussion on the Bacon-Shakespeare question by the learned associates of the Dresden Philological Society. The first part was given in the last number of this periodical, BACONIANA, January, 1910, p. 33. The leader of the debate was Dr. Konrad Meier, Vice-rector of King George's College, Dresden, author of a learned book, already noticed in these columns as Klassisches in *Hamlet*. The report appeared in the *Dresdner Anzeiger*. The resumed discussion was held on Monday, March 14th, 1910. The two most influential advocates of the Baconian Hypothesis in Germany are Dr. Konrad Meier, of Dresden, and Professor Holzer, of Heidelberg. Professor Holzer has written a number of pamphlets on the question. The titles of them are as follows:—

1. Shakespeare's *Tempest* in Baconian Light. A new theory.

2. Bacon-Shakespeare: der Verfasser des Sturms. (Ein Vortaag).

3. Die Apotheose, Bacon-Shakespeares.

4. Kuno Fischer's irrige Ecklärung der Poetik Bacons.

5. Die Genesis der Bacon-Shakespeare-Frage.

6. Kommentar zu Shakespeare's Drama, *Julius Cæsar*, in Baconscher Beleuchtung.

7. Wei war Shakesepare ? ? ? Ein Weckruf von Professor S. Holzer au der ober realschule in Heidelberg, 1910. Professor Holzer has the design of writing a history of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy, and giving references to early allusions to and advocacies of Bacon's authorship, some of which have been overlooked both in Germany and England. A literary conference has been lately held at Zurich, at which Dr. Holzer was present, and where, he tells us, he had some "hard fights with the Coryphæi of Shakespeare lore. Yet a number of the members of the meeting were won, and there will set in, I suppose, a new impetus for Bacon." He has other conflicts and debates impending.]

THE debate was resumed by Professor Schmidt, who admitted that his belief in the accepted authorship of the Shakespearean poems had been shaken by Dr. Meier's address, but some matters still required further explanation from him. How can we account for the contradiction between the evident familiarity of the poet with classsical antiquity, and Ben Jonson's assertion that his Latin was small and his Greek less? Why did not Bacon, after his fall, make himself known as the author of the Sonnets and the poet of the dramas, and why were those who knew still silent after his death? As to the first point, Dr. K. Meier had already given an explanation in his work on the Classical Element in *Hamlet;* he there maintains that Ben Jonson's words require a different construction to that usually assigned to them. They mean, "Even supposing that the poet had small Latin and less Greek, yet still I would give him a place among the greatest poets of antiquity." So that Ben Jonson had not really affirmed—but only conditionally assumed—that

Shakespeare knew little of the classic languages. Equally erroneous opinions, however, seem to have gained currency as to Bacon's classical knowledge. It has been supposed that the classical languages were to a great extent Bacon's natural element, in which he thought and wrote. For example, this view is advocated by Dr. R. Hessen, well known as the author of a Shakesperean Biography in the journal for "Marz." For the most part, he remarks, the so-called Baconians show complete ignorance of that in which Bacon in London was specially occupied, so that they might be cross-questioned in this style—"In what language did Bacon really write?" The Baconian would generally promptly reply, "English, of course," and then you have caught him. But if he guesses right and replies, "Why, Latin," he is in a worse scrape still. But unfortunately this colossal ignorance is not characteristic of the Baconians, but of this Stratfordian gentleman who can make bold to write such nonsense without any fear of laying himself open to criticism. Bacon wrote and published many of his works in English, such as his "Essays," his work on the "Advancement of Learning," his "History of Henry VII.," his "Natural History," and others. In other cases he wrote in English and had his work translated into Latin before publication. This was the case with "De Augmentis."

As to the motives which induced him to refrain from acknowledging the authorship of Shakespeare, Dr. Meier affirmed that this was a question which must not be put, since he was not in a satisfactory position to answer it. The answer could only be given by Bacon himself. If he or any of his friends had given the required explanation, the question would be no longer asked; it would have been finally answered long ago. We can only stand fast by the actual facts, of which there is abundant contemporary evidence, that

stage players were used as covers for authors of high rank; it is a fact also that Bacon called himself a "concealed poet," and that he was applauded by his contemporaries as the greatest poet of his time. One cannot avoid drawing some conclusions from both these facts and putting them together; while at the same time other facts strengthen this juxtaposition. If Bacon did not wish to be known as an author, it would not be difficult for him to keep up the fiction. Perhaps we should never have heard of Sir Walter Scott as the Waverley novelist if his publisher, Ballantyne, had not become bankrupt, and Scott was consequently compelled to disclose himself. If, however, we press the question why Bacon did not wish to be known we can only form conjectures; and two such possibilities Dr. Meier had pointed out: 1, The small respect which dramatic poets enjoyed, so that occupation of this kind would be prejudicial to a statesman in quest of promotion; and 2, the confidence which such an author as Bacon must have possessed that he would be ultimately recognised as the personality embodied in the poems.

Professor Besser then went fully into the evidence given by Ben Jonson in his "Discoveries," and in the Sonnet written in celebration of Bacon's 60th birthday. There is a section in the "Discoveries," devoted to Shakespeare, avowing that he had loved and honoured him, although he also said that he wished he had blotted out a thousand of his lines, and that he was too verbose and sometimes made himself absurd. If in later sections Shakespeare is *not* mentioned, it seems evident this is owing to the fact that Jonson had already given him an article. In his subsequent "Discoveries" he was concerned with eminent orators. It is not easy to suppose that Ben Jonson would have lent himself to a literary fraud. He may have written the preface to the Folio edition for the editors, but this was a practice not

at all unusual at that time. The Sonnet on Bacon's birthday was dedicated to the *Genius loci*, and the word *mystery* intimates that some matter of weight and importance was hidden.

Dr. Meier here remarks that the question how far Ben Jonson was cognisant of Bacon's literary secrecies did not enter into the scope of his discussion, and as to the question of authorship it was of no great significance.

The "Discoveries" did not appear till the year 1641, in the second volume of Jonson's works, published after his death, and when the several sections were composed it is difficult to conjecture. Cunningham calls them the last drops of his pen. Dr. Meier pointed out the undeniable contradiction which exists between the passage in which Shakespeare's works are spoken of as beyond all praise and that in the "Discoveries" in which Ben Jonson notes him as faulty and bombastic, so that a great number of his lines could be dispensed with. The one verse, however, which Jonson has attacked, Dr. Meier had proved to be quite blameless. Moreover it must be remembered that the passage relating to Shakespeare is separated by sections on different topics from those which treat of literary subjects, where Ben Jonson pens a section on renowned orators, then on the foremost of the admirable speakers of his time, *i.e.*, Bacon. This is followed by a section in which pre-eminent writers are enumerated, and here Shakespeare is not mentioned; but, on the other hand, Bacon is again pointed out as the one who in all departments of literature has accomplished that which is unrivalled—the ἄκμη of achievement. There was, by the way, no reason for the imputation of literary fraud, for it rests alone with the author to determine whether he himself shall appropriate the distinction or whether he shall allow another person, real or imaginary, to be so invested.

In continuing the discussion, Professor Schumann contended that the slight esteem entertained by dramatic writers might well be a cogent reason why gentlemen of high rank should not publicly claim such authorship. On this Dr. Philipp remarked that he had not found in any English grammar of that time any authority derived from a dramatic writer.

Professor Schumann and Mr. Virgin alluded to the circumstances connected with Bacon's relations with the Earl of Essex. Bacon was continually censured as guilty of ingratitude to his benefactor. To this Dr. Meier replied that, even were that true, it had nothing to do with the question of authorship; but the reproach was really unjust. Bacon, as one of the Queen's Counsel, was officially connected with the prosecution of Essex; this duty was assigned to him by the Queen, and he was compelled to defend the Indictment and was unable to help the Earl by any services of private friendship. In the judgment of Essex, however, twenty-five members of the House of Lords concurred, so that he was judged by his peers. As to Bacon's alleged contempt for living languages, that also is a fable, as is evident from his own knowledge of such languages, and from those of his works written in English. He indeed had his philosophical works translated into Latin, and this because Latin was the general language of learned men, and, in Bacon's opinion, would always remain so. He has himself said that the man who travels in foreign countries without knowing the languages does not travel; he goes to school.

Dr. Meier was then invited to produce some parallels with special characteristics; it was desired that he should adduce passages which Bacon had probably composed before the plays were written, but which were not printed till after they had been published. The speaker pointed out how difficult it was to comply

with this demand, for often it could not be ascertained when Bacon wrote the works of late appearance, and, on the other hand, the actual time when the plays were composed could not be definitely fixed. Nothing can be more absurd than the effort to maintain that the great author and the renowned philosopher whose fame for learning resounded throughout Europe had borrowed his knowledge from the works of an unlearned stage-player. Dr. Meier then produced an astonishing number of parallels. Next he showed that the poet had a perfectly comprehensive acquaintance with the treasury of words contained in classic literature, and sought to ingraft them into his native English. Thus, in the first Quarto Edition of *Hamlet*, 1603, the King said that the poisoned cup should be Hamlet's *period*. Here the word means death. In this sense the first instance given in the Oxford Dictionary is found in the year 1639. But it was quite accurately used in this sense by Shakespeare thirty-six years earlier, as is shown by Erasmus, who writes in his "Adagia" (217): "Theologi metam vitæ fatalam *periodum* appellant." This erudite form of expression disappeared in the later editions, another word being substituted. (See *Hamlet*, 1603, IV. vii. 471. Cambridge Edition.) In the first Quarto of *Hamlet*, Marcellus and Horatio are called "*partners* of my watch;" in later editions the word *rivals* is used. The speaker had not been able, either in a Latin or in a French author, to find the word used precisely in this sense, and in the Oxford Dictionary no authority is given—a proof that Shakespeare, using the word in this sense, stands entirely alone. In *Anthony and Cleopatra* he uses it also, so that the notion that there is here a printer's error is excluded. The word could only have been used in this sense by an author who was familiar with classic etymology. Thus Ulpianus has: "Rivales qui per eundum rivum aquam

ducunt." [Rivals are those who draw water from the same river (*rivus*).]

In *Cymbeline* V. v. the etymology of the word *Mulier* is given as *Mollis aer*. That is, by no means, nonsense, which a learned man like Bacon would not have written. If we turn to Forcellini we find that Isidorus writes as follows: "Mulier a mollitie tanquam mollier, detractâ literâ et mutatâ, appellata est mulier." [Mulier, derived from mollities, as if written mollier; mulier becomes mollier by removing and changing one letter.] Bacon repeatedly calls hairs and nails *excrements*. In the Oxford Dictionary the first use of the word in this sense is attributed to Shakespeare. One is inclined to say, This plainly proves that Shakespeare was no scholar; the word is derived from excerno, not from excresco, from which excrescence would have been derived by a scholar like Bacon. He evidently borrowed this technicality from Shakespeare, for in his "Syl. Syl.," 58, he says: "Living creatures, after their period of growth, part with nothing that is young, except hair and nails, which are *excrements* and no parts."

In *Julius Cæsar* the word *Lethe* is used as equivalent to *Death*, and no authority for this is given in the Oxford Dictionary, except Shakespeare. Also the word *Replication* is used as equivalent to *Echo* (*Julius Cæsar* I. i. 47), for which use Shakespeare is not given as an authority in the Oxford Dictionary.

There are hundreds of such words in Shakespeare borrowed directly from the classics, and in which the poet is absolutely alone. Every one of these words shows that the author is a very learned man, who is expressly active in the coining of words. Bacon is known to have been such a man. Dr. Meier then pointed out the agreement between Shakespeare and Bacon, especially in *Hamlet*, in reference to the means

of poetic expression, and pointed out a large number of quotations from the "Adagia" of Erasmus, which Bacon has put into his notebook ("The Promus"). These words were employed by Shakespeare.

He then produced instances of identical ideas. Out of the abundance of these given by Dr. Meier, only a few can be here cited.

In *Measure for Measure* it is said that the "law hath not been dead though it hath slept." Mr. Rushton has shown that in this passage a sentence from the "Institutions" is translated: "Dormiunt aliquando leges, moriuntur nunquam." Did Bacon copy from Shakespeare when he repeats this maxim in the "De Augmentis"? "Intelligitur hoc de legibus cum evigelent, non cum dormitent?" ("Works" I. 816, V. 99).

In *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth says of her husband that his nature is "too full of the milk of human kindness to catch the nearest way" (I. v. 13). In the "Promus" (532, 1,247) the maxim is found: "It is in action as in ways, commonly the nearest is the foulest." This is quoted in the "Apophthegms" as a saying of "Mr. Bacon," probably Bacon's father; and it is found in the "De Augmentis" VIII. ii. The foul way is also described in *Macbeth* III. i. 1—3. Our own often-quoted proverb is, "The best way is the *straight* way."

Hamlet concludes his letter to Ophelia (II. ii. 121): "Thine evermore, most dear lady, whilst the machine is to him." Here the word machine represents the word body. Up to now it has not been explained by the commentators. The expression cannot be found in the classics. In "Melancthon," however, the phrase "tota machina corporis" is frequently used, and Bacon in his introduction to the "History of Life and Death" refers to the "officinam corporis et machinas, et organa" ("Work" II., 106, V. 219).

In the year 1603 Bacon sent to King James a short treatise on the union between Scotland and England, giving also a slight description of "Persian Magic." In this treatise the maxim occurs, "The greater should draw the less. So we see when two lights do meet, the greater doth darken and drown the less. And when a smaller river runs into a greater, it leeseth both the name and the stream" (see "Life" III. 98). The Persian Magic is intended to show the "correspondencies between the architectures and fabrics of things natural and civil," a sort of Swedenborgian doctrine of correspondences. Bacon was a mystic, and he contends that political affairs should conform to the laws of nature; and precisely the same application of these two specimens of natural laws which govern also states is found in the *Merchant of Venice*. In the 5th Act, when Portia is near her own home, she says:—

> "That light we see is burning in my hall.
> How far that little candle throws his beams."

And now comes the application to human affairs:—

> "So shines a good deed in a naughty world."

Nerissa, her maid, turns back to natural things and gives an example of a greater light overpowering a lesser,—

> "When the moon shone we did not see the candle."

And now Portia states the general law, alike in civil and natural things,—

> "So doth the greater glory dim the less,"

and confirms the civil axiom by another case besides that of a small light being darkened by a greater. The second illustration is that of a stream:—

> "A substitute shines brightly as a King,
> Until a King be by, and then his state

> Empties itself, as doth an inland brook,
> Into the main of waters."—V. i. 89.

The simple axiom is stated in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* III. i. 353, in *Cymbeline* IV. ii. 244, and in *Lear* III. iv. 8—the two very remarkable double instances only in the *Merchant of Venice* and in Bacon's discourse.

Such coincidences of thought and illustration could originate only in one brain. Whether this be so or not, we see what a striking light is cast upon the poems by the study of Bacon's writings.

In conclusion, Dr. Meier referred to one further question—the cryptogram. In reference to this he said that in the year 1605 Bacon had affirmed that, when a young man, he had invented a secret method of writing by which anything could be expressed by variations of five letters. In 1623 he gave a key to this method of secret writing by which anyone can in a given paragraph infold a second paragraph, by arranging the letters into sets of five and deriving single letters from the order of the letters, as described in the key; so that in an apparently quite innocent letter one of a different nature may be inserted. It is believed that such secret interpolations have been found in certain books. The speaker had not given any special attention to this subject, but expressed his opinion that, without such attempts, the question might be settled. It might, however, be better to leave this matter alone rather than bring the real question itself into discredit.

Finally, the President reminded the audience that such a question certainly could not be decided by a vote, and that no such debate as theirs could be supposed to settle such an important question. But he would venture to say that the arguments brought forward by Dr. Meier against the authorship of the actor and for the

authorship of Francis Bacon had not been refuted or proved worthless, and it was therefore most desirable that the authorship of Bacon should be reinvestigated with all earnestness and impartiality, and that on this account a wider investigation and more fundamental research must be undertaken,

Translated by R. M. THEOBALD.

NEWS FROM GERMANY.

WHEN, studying Shakespeare's *Tempest* in 1904, I was led to a conviction that Francis Bacon must be the author of the play, I had no inkling (to use a Baconian word) of the smart and brisk fighting about the Bacon controversy already going on in England before. Nor had I when, in the following years, I tried to awake some interest for the problem in Germany, any knowledge of the fact that *Konrektor Konrad Meier*, of *Dresden*, while pursuing his investigations in *Hamlet*, had come to the same conclusion as I had concerning the authorship of Shakespeare's plays.

At the present day, after Konrad Meier has delivered his masterly speech (on the 29th of March, 1909) at a meeting of the members of the Dresden Society for the Study of Modern Languages, it would seem that, in regard to the Bacon controversy, the scales are beginning to turn in Germany. This casting discourse was followed by two debates, the result of which, as mentioned in the latest BACONIANA, was the prevailing of an opinion "that the play-actor Shaxper could hardly be regarded any longer as the author of the plays, whilst the hypothesis that Bacon was the real author deserved full attention and careful research."

By this remarkable move onward a new position has

been created in Germany. A number of Shakespeare disciples, even philologists, have been startled in their belief in the tradition, and some of them have set to work in order to come to a true self-insight in this matter by a serious investigation of their own. Mr. Wallace's last discovery, published in *Harper's Magazine* (March, 1910), has markedly added to this revulsion. And if now the solution promised by *Mr. Tanner* should definitely prove a success, the ground for the new seed or creed would not be altogether unprepared in "the Fatherland," and a sort of review, a summing up of the long tale of suffering which the Baconians have had to go through since the days of poor Miss Delia Bacon would then, of course, become desirable or necessary. In this interesting bibliography, commenced already by Wyman many years ago, America, no doubt, will march in the front, whilst Germany, I am sorry to say, will have to be represented as pitiably straggling in the rear.

Taking in hand our "*Shakespeare Jahrbucher*," that have been published ever since 1865, now issued in 46 volumes, an inexhaustible treasury and repertory of Shakespearean wisdom, and, for a while at least, a most sensitive reflector or speculum of the Baconian movement, we there find the first noteworthy review of the "Baconian craze" mentioned in *1882* (Vol. XVII.) The books of Nathaniel Holmes, Edw. Vining, Will Thomson, and of Mrs. Achmead Windle are spoken of therein rather contemptuously as "Transatlantic or transmarine products." Three years later a verbose and most supercilious account is given by *F. A. Leo* about "the ludicrous attempts of the Baconians" abroad and in the *Fatherland*, viz., *Wyman's Bibliography*, the foundation of the Bacon Society under the auspices of *Appleton Morgan;* and (what horrible crime!) the *first* contribution to a *German paper* (1st March, 1884), and

the "*Bacon Myth*," translated into German by Dr. Karl Müller-Mylius (1885); Mrs. *Pott's Promus*, etc., all of which could not find favour in Leo's eyes. He still uses, strange to say, the Latin declension: *Baco*, genitive; Baco-*nis* (!).

Another acrimonious philippic is by the same "lion" directed against the "Bacon craze" in Vol. XXIV. (*1889*) in regard to *Donnelly's* cryptogram, and concerning the *first Baconian book written in German*, both of which are consigned to perdition, whereas *Mrs. Ch. Stopes's* book ("The Bacon-Shakspere Question Answered") is extolled to the very skies. The first *German book* written in defence of the Bacon theory by *Graf Vitzthum von Eckstaedt* (*1888*) turned out to be the best in comparison with the few that followed. It was dedicated to Kuno Fischer, the biographer of Francis Bacon, and was at once refuted by three pamphlets written by *Schaible*, *Professor Wülker*, and *Professor Schipper*, one of whom ingenuously admitted in later years that, though having written two pamphlets against Bacon, "he had not read the Magna Instauratio." Even in our days another stout opponent to the Bacon hypothesis is of opinion that in sustaining *Shakspr's* authorships of the plays he is not bound to study Bacon's works.

After a fool-peace of some years there was to come for the Baconians in Germany the "*Dies Irae*," a "*Dies ater*," owing to the great *auto-da-fé* or hecatomb accomplished by *Kuno Fischer* on *23rd* April, *1895*. As "summus index" he pronounced his fiat on *Vitzthum von Eckstaedt*, and *Edwin Borman*, the author of a *second Baconian book* written in Germany, "*Das Shakespeare-Geheimnis*" (1894), which during the following years was succeeded by some more "heretic" books written by the same author. It is particularly worthy of note that Kuno Fischer, who, knowing English but indiffer-

ently, used to read Bacon's works in Latin and Shakespeare's plays in German translations, yet pronounced his fiat on Vitzthum von Eckstaedt, who, having lived for fourteen years in England, knew the English of Shakespeare much better than any of the learned "Anglicists" in Germany. But Vitzthum did not belong to the "learned fraternity," and this in itself was reason enough for condemning him along with his book. And the whole fraternity of *Anglicists* then devoutedly worshipped Kuno Fischer as the "Hercules who had killed the Bacon Hydra."

Since that time there has continued in Germany a hollow, funereal peace concerning the Bacon controversy. The great number of Baconian books written since in England and America were, as a rule, simply registered in the "Jahrbucher." No more philippics, no more fiats. "The foolish attempts of the Baconians" were simply ignored with an affected indifference and a stuck-up haughtiness, accompanied by some occasional lashes at their "arrogating vanity." Our High School professors, appointed for teaching English literature and language at our universities, most of whom are celebrated for their paramount learning in their respective departments, are irrevocably joined (*solidarisch verbunden*) in rejecting the "scandalous" Bacon theory and in unflinchingly keeping up their "*Shakspr*" worship. In obstinately condemning the Baconian heresy as tending "to dishonour the sacred memory of the great poet," they refuse to see how much more he is honoured by identifying him with the peerless genius of those times who, giant-like, as Kuno Fischer himself submits, thrust himself over the heads and shoulders of all his contemporaries as the one "central figure."

What our anti-Baconians are particularly apprehensive of is the enthusiastic assurance of the Baconians and the highly contagious persuasiveness of their creed.

The policy employed by them is therefore designed to choke the Baconian movement, to treat the Baconians as pariahs standing outside the pale of "gauged science." In this policy *there may be*—I would not for my life say more—*there may be* a smack of human vanity. Only think that perhaps—*perhaps* (*!*)—the whole "*Shakspr*" worship for which they have been fighting so long might prove in the end a fad, a bubble. What then?

What is particularly striking in the last dozen volumes of the "Jahrbucker" is, in the first place, a tremendous spring-tide of Shakespearean literature. The number of *Shakespeareana* in the Weimar library which had come to about *2,500* up to the year *1905*, has been more than doubled during the succeeding five years. The second curious item is a noticeable increase of books treating of Bacon in the conventional way. In this deluge-like flood of Shakespeare literature the books that follow the Baconian creed, like Edwin Reed's, Begley's, &c., are only felt as a very feeble undercurrent.

Yet we must not despair. The younger generation in Germany are being initiated into the doctrines of "*Baconus Hastivibrans.*" In our century, which is generally hailed as the truth-seeking epoch in all quarters, exactly what Bacon strove in vain to effectuate in *his age*, there may, after the havoc of four destructive tide-waves (1882—1895)—the fourth being a baleful groundswell—buoy up a sweeping spring-tide powerful enough to carry off with it the conspiracy of ill-will, the resistence of stubborn intolerance and malicious envy.

Before long, let us hope, we shall have definitely ascertained as to what shrine we shall have to resort to on our pilgrimage at the poet's imminent tercentenary.

G. Holzer.

Heidelberg.

A SUPPOSED UNPUBLISHED ESSAY BY FRANCIS BACON,

COPIED FROM MS. IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM BY A. C. BUNTEN

(*Probable date, before* 1600),

ON THE ORIGINAL POWER OF PEOPLE TO CHOOSE KINGS.

FOREWORD.

THE following essay has strong evidence of Francis Bacon's pen in its general style of construction, and phraseology. As the writing proceeds, new points arise which are caught at, and, in true lawyer fashion, he builds only to show how well he can destroy; for example, with a touch of humour he asks why—granted a people are born free—should they choose a man to govern them, and give him power of life and death over them? Each man in this way may be guilty of being a murderer of himself.

Again, he argues, as it is impossible that the whole people of the whole world should vote at the same time, why should free men be bound by what other men choose to bind them to by vote.

Once more;—a child being born free from subjection can discard the obligations his parents have undertaken for him without his consent during his nonage; but in nature, Bacon goes on to say, there is no nonage, so children can never be bound by their parents' vote, for if the acts of the parents bind their children, "then farewell the doctrine of natural freedom of mankind."

We can easily discern the period at which Bacon wrote this essay to be a year or two before Queen Elizabeth's death, when her ministers failed in getting

the aged Queen to name her successor, or allow the subject to be mentioned in her presence.

But behind her back all eyes were turned to Scotland, where James VI. was ready and willing to tread the most attractive road in Scotland, namely, "the one that led to England," and he eagerly entered into correspondence with Elizabeth's ministers, who were preparing for their future advancement by acknowledging James' undoubted right to the English throne. In fact, most men, including Essex, Burleigh, Raleigh, and Bacon, were discussing the Act of Succession, and Francis Bacon at Gray's Inn probably amused himself by drawing up this summary of the rights of a free-born people to refuse to put themselves under a monarch who has the power of life and death. Queen Elizabeth had given terrible evidence of her power in this way.

When Bacon's essays were published he dare not include this one among them, and after King James had mounted the throne, the author certainly found the moment was even less propitious for telling the people they were born free from subjection.

It is interesting also to note that Bacon about this time was in correspondence with Galileo about the ebb and flow of the sea, and that it is evidently in his mind when writing this essay. Like the printed essays we also find the words "in conclusion" towards the end of the article. A photograph of the folio page is given to show that the writing has great resemblance to Francis Bacon's.

The Essay.

Those who maintain that originally Power is in the People, and that the People at first choose Kings, may not be offended if they be asked in what sense they understand this word "People" for this, and many other words hath different acceptions: being sometimes taken in a larger, and other times in a narrow

or stricter sense, and in a larger sense literally, the word People doth signifie the whole multitude of all mankind, but figuratively or synecdochecally it means, many times, the major part of a multitude, or sometimes the better, or the richer, or the wiser, or some other part, and oftimes a very small part of the People if there be no other apparent opposed party, hath the name of the People by presumtion.

Now if they understand the entire multitude, or whole People originally have power to choose a King, they know that by rule and principle of nature, all mankind in the world is but one People, and born all alike as they suppose to an equal freedom from subjection, if they will speak like naturalists, for naturall liberty is the ground of their supposed freedom to choose their King, and if they mark it well, and where there is freedom from subjection there all things are common, and all mankind hath a common interest in them, and therefore but by a joint consent of the whole world People no one thing can be made proper to any man, but it will be an injury and usurpation upon the common right of others; from thence it folows that natural freedom being once granted, there cannot be any one man chosen King without the universal consent of all the People in the world, *nemine contradicente;* nay, though all mankind should concurre in one vote, it cannot seem reasonable that they should have a power to alter the laws of nature, if nature have made all men free, and if no man have power to take away his owne life without being a murderer of himself, how can any People confer such power, as they have not themselves, upon any one man without being accessory to their own deathe, and every particular man becomes guilty of *felo de se.*

If this general signification of the world People be disavowed, and men will suppose that the people of

particular countries and regions have freedom to choose themselves Kings, let them but observe the consequences. Since nature hath not distinguished the habitable world into kingdoms, nor determined what part of the People shal belong to one kingdom, and what to another, it follows that the original freedom of mankind being granted, every man is at liberty to be of what kingdom he pleases, and so every petty company to make a kingdom by itself and not only city but every village, and every family, nay, and every particular man at liberty to choose himself to be his own king if he pleases, and he were a madman that being by nature free would choose any man but himself to be his own governor, thus he avoide the haveing but of one King of the whole world, we that fall into a liberty of having as many kings as there be men which upon the matter is to have no King at all, but to leave all men their natural liberty which is the mischief the pleader for natural liberty would most avoid.

But it will be said that we daily see many People joyne in choosing others to be their King. This indeed is thus far true, that many of those who have been under government alreddy and see that if they do not choose one they like, others will choose, or else someone will usurp upon them; in such a case necessity enforces for avoiding of a greater mischief to make choice of a less, by electing one in whom they may best confide, but that this hath been true of a People that have always been free and at liberty by nature, doth neither appear nor can be proved.

But if neither the whole People of the world, nor the whole People of any one part of the world be meant, but only the major or some other part of a part of the world, still the objections are the stronger, for besides that nature hath made no partition of the world of the People into distinct kingdoms, and that without a

universal consent of all mankind at one and the same instant, no partition can be made yet if it were lawful for particular parts of the world by consent to choose their King, nevertheless their elections would bind none to subjection, but only such as consented, for the major part never binds but where other men agree to be so bound, or where a higher power so commands; there being no power higher than nature but only God, where neither God nor nature do appoint the major part to bind, their consent is not binding to any but only to themselves that consent.

But for the present to gratify them so far as to admit that either by nature or a general consent of mankind, the world at first divided into particular kingdoms and the major part of the People: If each kingdom assembled were allowed to choose their King, yet it cannot be said that ever the whole People of any nation or indeed ever any considerable part of the whole ever assembled; ffor except by some secret instinct they should all meete at one time and place what one man or company of men less than the whole hath power to appoint either the time or place of election where all be alike free by nature; and without a lawful summons its unjust to bind those that be absent:

The whole cannot summons itself, one man is sick, another is lame, a third is aged, a fourth is under age of discretion all those at some or other times or at some place or other might be able to meet if they might choose their own time and place as man naturally free should.

In assemblies that are by human politique constitutional; the superior power that ordaines those parte assemblies can regulate and confine them both for time, place and persons, and other circumstances: but where there is an equality by natur there can be no superior power, then every infant at the instant it is borne in,

hath a live interest with the greatest and wisest man in the world ;

Mankind is by nature like the sea, perpetually ebbing and flowing every minute, one is borne, another dies: no one time can be indifferent for all mankind to assemble, it cannot but be alwaies mischievous, at the least to all infants.

But to solve this it will be said that infants and children may be included in the votes of their parents.

This remedy indeede cures the mischief but it destroys the cause, and at last stumbles upon the right original of government, for if it be allowed that the acts of parents shall bind their children, then farewell the doctrine of the natural freedom of mankind :

If it be replied that not all children shall be included in their parents consent, but onely those that are under age, consider, in Nature there is no nonage: if a man be not borne free she doth not assigne any other time when they shall attaine their freedome: or if she had, then such children attaining that age shal be discharged of their parents contract: Thus in conclusion if it be but imagined that the People were but once free by nature from subjection it will prove a meere impossibility ever lawfully to introduce any kind of government whatsoever without apparent wrong to the multitude of People.

A CORROBORATION AND CONFIRMATION OF STATEMENTS

FOUND IN THE MATHEMATICAL CIPHER IN THE 1623 FOLIO EDITION OF THE SHAKE-SPEARE PLAYS AS DECIPHERED BY ASSISTANT-GOVERNOR IGNATIUS DONNELLY (1831—1901), OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

1. THE account of the war in Holland during the reign of Henry the Eighth between 1510 and 1516 as related in this cipher account.

The Hon. Ignatius Donnelly states that he had never read or known anything about this war until he found that account in the mathematical cipher. He then consulted the historical accounts as found in the histories of various European nations, and there he found many of the statements as recorded in Bacon's cipher were confirmed by the historians of that period.

2. In the cipher it is stated that the woman whom "willm Shagsper" (1563—1616) of Stratford was forced to marry, was a widow Whateley whom he had seduced. Mr. Donnelly's solution of the puzzle concerning the "Anna Whateley" of the marriage license of Nov. 27, 1582, and the "Ann Hathwey" of the marriage bond of Nov. 28, 1582, is this: the widow Whateley gave her correct name when the marriage license was made out, but the next day when the bond was drawn up at the instigation of her friends, Fulcon Sandels and John Richardson, they gave her maiden name by which they had known her all her life, which was the most natural thing for them to do.

This is the most reasonable and satisfactory solution of the "wm. Shoxfper et Anna Whateley" of the license, and the "willm Shagfper" and "Ann Hathwey" of the bond. (For a fac-simile of the license and

bond, see J. W. Gray's "Shake-speare's Marriage and Departure from Stratford," London, 1905, or *New Shakespeareana* of July, 1906.) As the names Fulcon Sandels and John Rychardson, which appear on the bond and who apparently were the men that forced Shagsper to marry the woman he had seduced, are the same as the names of the men who are mentioned in the will of Richard Hathwey (proved 1582), it tends to confirm the supposition that Mrs. Ann (Hathwey) Whateley was a daughter of this Richard Hathwey, although there is no daughter Ann mentioned in his will. The baptism of the "premature Susanna" on May 26, 1583 (she may have been born a few days or weeks after Nov. 28, 1582, for all we can tell) thoroughly confirms the seduction business. It seems, on perusing his will, that notwithstanding the circumstances of her birth, this Susanna was "Shagsper's" favourite daughter and received from him by far the largest portion of his property.

3. The story of the poaching and property-destroying operations of Shagsper and his comrades, as related in this cipher story by Harry Percy (a body-servant of Francis Bacon), who had lived in Stratford, is very plausible and probable.

That there was such a servant or retainer of Bacon's as Harry Percy is an historical fact. He is mentioned in the letters of Mrs. Nicholas Bacon (1528—1610) to her foster-son Francis, he is mentioned in Bacon's will; other references to him have been found.

The poaching and deer-slaying stories have been generally accepted, even by the most rabid "Shagsperites," as the reason why "Shagsper" was forced to leave Stratford and to remain away for several years.

4. The account of Harry Percy's trip to "willm Shagsper's" home at Stratford, where Shagsper lived always after 1595, with the exception of possibly two or

three absences of short duration; of Percy's forcing "Shagsper" to leave the country for a time, how he was concealed near St. Albans, one of the homes of Bacon, until Percy could put him on a ship at the London Docks; the description of the drunken habits of the younger brother Gilbert (1566—1612), &c., are all very possibly a true and correct statement.

"Rychard Quyney" (1540 (?)—1602), of Stratford, was in London from the Spring of 1598 to the Spring of 1599. On Oct. 28, 1598, he sent to "Wm. Shackfpear" at Stratford a letter asking for the loan of thirty pounds (£30). Had "Shagsper" been in London at that time "Rychard Quyney" would certainly never have written to him at Stratford. There was a "Wm. Shakfpear" recorded in Stratford records on Feb. 4, 1598—9 as owner of "X quarters of corn." Lately, some of the "Stratfordians," not wanting to accept any record of "Shagsper" being in Stratford in the years 1598—1599, when the plays *Rychard ye Second* and *Rychard ye Third* were printed with the name of "William Shakespeare" as the author, state that there was another "William Shakspear" living in Stratford at that time, who was a grain dealer and undoubtedly the man who was recorded as the third largest owner of corn in Stratford. They recognise the imperative necessity of having "Shagsper" in London at this time, if he published those plays that year. To get over the obstacles to the acceptation of their theories, many of them assert that Shagsper never took any pains to issue the plays, and neither knew or cared anything about their publication. This if stated about any other author of the past three centuries would be deemed too absurd for a moment's consideration. The necessities of the case, however, require that the Shagsperite deem nothing too unreasonable or absurd when it concerns "willm Shagsper," of Stratford, and when by maintaining

such fantastic theories they will tend to support them in their pretended belief. For a further illustration of this "peculiar aberration of the Shagsperite mind," read Mark Twain's latest book, "Is Shakespeare Dead?" in which book the late Mr. Clemmens ridicules in his inimitable and unapproachable manner the "vagaries" of the average "Shagsperite" of the present day.

The story of the drunken brother, Gilbert Shagsper, and of Harry Percy's knocking him down into the cellar is very probable. He was never married, as no woman would have such a man. Before he died he had become an idiot or insane as the result of his vicious habits. "Gilbertus adolescens" is the record at the time of his burial; that is "An Innocent," as crazy people and idiots were then called, and are so called by many at the present day. As none of Shagsper's brothers are mentioned in his will, it is apparent that they were all dead by 1616. The story of a brother Charles living to an extreme old age is only a sample of the "fiction" that has been and is still concocted time and again by the lunatic Shagsperites.

Mr. Parker Woodward and others have found many things that confirm the statements of the "Word" and "Bi-literal" ciphers. Before the paragraph quoted below had appeared in Mr. Woodward's book, "The Strange Case of Francis Tidir," page 7, which is as follows: "I have found no recorded facts inconsistent with the cipher claim, but much in history that supports it," an American Shake-peare student and writer, the late Wm. H. Burr (1821—1908), had made and written a similar statement and argument. While Mr. Woodward refers only to the "Word" and Bi-literal ciphers, Mr. Burr included the mathematical and other ciphers in his statement.

The comparisons and confirmations commenced and indicated in this article might be carried on to a much

greater extent by Baconians who reside in England, where the original documents, historical records, etc., which relate to this period are accessible. It is hoped by the writer that acting on these hints they will follow up and add to these suggestions.

AN AMERICAN GENEALOGIST.

NOTES.

IN view of Dr. Appleton's severe strictures on those students of Bacon who do not discard without examination claims of the discovery of cyphers in which his (Bacon's) works are referred to, it is reassuring to know that he stands well outside the Baconian fold. This is evident from the fact that on page 12 of *New Shakespeareana* for February, 1910, he makes this statement:—

> "To ordinary intellects the first folio was printed in 1623 because Mrs. Shakespeare (relict of William) died, thus releasing whatever rights she had by life estate or otherwise in the sixteen plays not already entered in the Records of the Stationers' Company. This surmise appeals to one's common-sense, because on November 8th, 1623, Iaggard and Blount entered for their copy on these registers the names of these sixteen plays. No lawyer with these facts before him could conjecture otherwise than that this coincidence of dates meant or inferred that Mrs. Shakespeare* had possessed some authority to withhold these plays from publication for reasons best known to herself, which reasons failed or title lapsed with her death. Possibly being a Puritan, and considering stage plays and all things theatrical as instruments of the devil, she suppressed them by sacrismet advice—more

* There is no record that any lady of that name died in 1623, or ever lived at that period.

> probably she held out for more lucrative offers; the Puritan did not always object to his neighbour being dammed in the next world if the cash was satisfactory in this, which we cannot find fault with, since it has preserved to us sixteen Shakespeare plays which otherwise we would never have possessed. Her death, then, having released these sixteen plays they were printed and published."

There is not a shred of evidence which can be produced to support this very circumstantial story. It is "conjecture" of the wildest Stratfordian stamp. It is clear from the foregoing extract that Dr. Morgan is free from the taint of heresy. In the last chapter of his autobiography he has ranged himself beside Mr. Sidney Lee and others of that ilk who "know so much that is not so."

Since the foregoing note was written a letter has been received from Dr. Morgan, which appears in another column. Dr. Morgan's "old acquaintance" with BACONIANA is well known to us, as are also his contributions to Shakespearean literature. He, like most of his Stratfordian *confrères*, will not permit men to differ from him and break up new ground. He has not patience to argue with them; he adopts a more effective method of dealing with the innovators, so he describes them as "callow and half-baked, if not absolutely ignorant or crazy." That is Dr. Morgan's method, and, of course, it effectually ends discussion.

Some of the book sales in the early part of the last century were on a scale which are unknown in these times. The library of Mr. Isaac Reed, the celebrated editor of the works of Shakespeare, was offered for public auction on the 2nd November, 1807,

and 38 following days (Sundays excepted) in 8,957 lots. A First Folio edition, 1623, of the Shakespeare plays realised £38, whilst a second edition with manuscript reference fetched £5. A copy of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1619, was sold for 7s. 6d. Ben Jonson's "Sejanus," 1605, went for 7s. "Bacon's Essaies," 1st edition, 1597, was sold with the "Unreasonableness of Atheism," for 1s. A copy of the 1598 edition was included with "Corne-Wallys Essayes," 1600, and brought £1 6s. Malone was one of the principal purchasers. He bought a copy of the 1612 "Essaies" for £1 2s., and a first edition of the "Wisdom of the Ancients," 1619, for 16s. Unless there is a misprint in the catalogue, a copy of an edition of the "Essays," unknown at the present day, changed hands. Lot No. 1,772 realised 16s., and is thus described:—"Bacon (Francis Lord) Essayes, Lond. 1622." Arber does not mention this edition, nor is there a copy in the British Museum. "T. Bright on Melancholy," 1586, was sold for 4s.; Cervantes' "History of Don Quixotte," 2 Vols., 1612—1620, for 5s. Robert Greene was more appreciated, for his "Ghost Haunting Conie-Catchers," 1602, brought £3, and his "Metamorphosis," 1617, £2 12s. 6d. Thomas Nashe was considered still more valuable, "Foure letters and certain Sonnets, especially touching Robert Greene: Imprinted by John Wolfe," sold for £11. Haslewood, who in 1812 reprinted the "Arte of English Poesie," attributed to Puttenham, was another large buyer. He secured a copy of that work (first edition) for £3 5s. The total proceeds of the sale were £4,386 19s. 6d. If the books then sold were submitted to auction to-day they would probably realise at least £50,000. Great as the increase of value would have been if they had been reserved for sale in these days it would not justify such a course from the point of view of investment. For if the proceeds of sale (£4,387) had

been left to accumulate at compound interest at 5% per annum the principal and accumulations would in 1905 have reached £561,536.

The late Dr. Churton Collins in an essay on The Porson of Shakespearean Criticism, says :—"The fate of Lewis Theobald is without parallel in literary history. It may be said with simple truth that no poet in our own or in any language has ever owed so great a debt to an editor as Shakespeare owes to this man.

The following verses appear opposite to the engraved page of the progenie of Geffrey Chaucer in the first complete edition of his works printed by Adam Islip, at the charges of Bonham Norton, in 1598 :—

THE READER TO GEFFREY CHAUCER.

Rea.— Where has thou dwelt, good Geffrey, al this while,
Unknowne to us, save only by thy bookes ?

Chau.—In haulks, and hernes, God wot, and in exile,
Where none vouchsaft to yeeld me words or lookes :
Till one which saw me there, and knew my friends,
Did bring me forth : such grace sometimes God sends.

Rea.— But who is he that hath thy books repar'd,
And added moe, whereby thou art more graced ?

Chau.—The selfe same man who hath no labor spar'd,
To helpe what time and writers had defaced :
And make old words, which were unknown of many,
So plaine, that now they may be known of any.

Rea.— Well fare his heart : I love him for thy sake,
Who for thy sake hath taken all this pains.

Chau.—Would God I knew some means amends to make,
That for his toile he might receive some gains.
But wot ye what ? I know his kindness such,
That for my good he thinks no pains too much :
And more than that ; if he had knowne in time,
He would have left no fault in prose nor rime.

H. B.

It would appear, therefore, Chaucer was equally indebted to someone who had edited his works and who preferred to remain unknown. Who was that unknown editor? Let a Baconian ask that question and the reply, accompanied with a smile of pity, will probably be "I suppose you are going to say that Bacon wrote Chaucer too." That is how the superior person (and all who are sufficiently ignorant not to be Baconians assume this superior attitude) regards the natural question which will suggest itself on reading the lines. The fact remains, however, that it is Francis Bacon who is referred to therein.

Only three claims have been made, with any evidence to support them, of discoveries of cipher-writing by Francis Bacon. In 1888 Ignatius Donelly published "The Great Cryptogram," which purported to explain Francis Bacon's cipher in the so-called Shakespeare plays. Dr. Orville Ward Owen, of Chicago, published about the year 1893 a work putting forward a claim which he had previously made in the press that he had discovered what has been termed "The Word Cipher." About the same time Mrs. Gallup, who had been working with Dr. Owen, published a volume on "The Biliteral Cipher." These claims have been examined by competent and by incompetent authorities, but so far there has not been any general acceptance on the part of the public, or even on the part of Baconians as a body, of any one of them. Mr. W. Stone Booth's acrostic signatures come under a different category. The prevalent use of anagrams and acrostic signatures in the Elizabethan period is well known to every serious student of that period. The author of *The Art of English Poesie*, William Camden, Ben Jonson, Joshua Sylvester, Thomas Randolp, John Taylor, and many other writers give prominence to them. Mr. Stone Booth's claim is that

he has discovered a *re*currence of a certain form of identifying mark in definite places in a series of works of suspected authorship. It is not, he says, a problem of *oc*currence of a certain form of mark in any place.

Mr. Tanner's work is still undergoing critical investigation by eminent mathematicians. No publicity will be given to the discoveries until they are supported by the testimony of independent critics of a character sufficiently decisive as to place their authenticity beyond doubt.

Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence has been meeting all comers in the South London Press. The arguments contained in the series of letters which he has contributed remain unanswered by his opponents and leave him in possession of the field.

The Bacon Society.

THE last lecture of the 1909—1910 session was delivered by Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence at his house, 13, Carlton House Terrace, on Thursday, the 30th of June, 1910. There was a large attendance. Mr. W. T. Smedley presided. *The Real Shakspere of Stratford-upon-Avon and the New Discoveries* was the subject.

The lecturer stated that he was about to give them a true history of William Shakspere which had never been made public before. This he did in the following words :—

"The real story is very simple. Eleven plays had been brought out anonymously, when, in consequence of political exigencies, it was absolutely necessary that a name should be immediately attached to them. Bacon had used the name William Shakespeare for his *Venus and Adonis* in 1593, and for his *Rape of Lucrece* in 1594. An extremely insignificant person, known as Shaks, or Shaksper, was found, who for the very large bribe of £1,000—equal to about £10,000 of our money—was willing to take the risk of being imprisoned. Accordingly, in 1597, New Place was purchased for him, and he was sent away to Stratford-on-Avon. When he had been got away, then and then only was the name of Shakespeare attached for the first time to a play, viz., *Love's Labour's Lost*, and immediately thereafter it was stated that the eleven other plays, and also the poems, were by this same person, and likewise the unpublished sonnets, which

were not printed till eleven years later, viz., in 1609. When Shakespeare went to Stratford no play had borne his name, and after his name had been attached to the plays, probably no one in London connected the name of Shakespeare with the hanger-on at the theatre, who had gone into the country. There never was a Shakespeare Company, Shakespeare never was a manager of any theatre, nor was he ever an actor of repute. Rowe, who brought out the fifth edition of the plays in 1709, prefixed to them the first 'Life of Shakespeare,' and he tells us that £1,000 was paid to him, and he also says, 'His name is printed—as the custom in those times amongst those of the other players—before some old plays, but without any particular account of what parts he used to play; and though I have inquired I could never meet with any further account of him this way than that the top of his performance was the ghost in his own *Hamlet*.' As the meanest super could easily play the part of the ghost in *Hamlet*, the purport of this story must be to tell us that Shakespeare's real claim to renown is that he played ghost (that is pseudonym) to Bacon. Rowe was evidently informed to a considerable extent, for page 55 is misprinted 53 to connect it with the real page 53, and thus afford a revelation; while in the whole book, containing 3,324 pages, there is no other mispagination."

Sir Edwin undertook to prove that there was no evidence to support the assumption that the signatures attributed to Shakspere were by his hand. In a manner which left little room for doubt a German lady had proved that the body of Shakspere's will was in the same handwriting as the three alleged signatures to it. He agreed with her conclusions and affirmed that the name of the testator had been added by the law clerk who copied out the will. The so-called signature on the purchase deed of the Blackfriars property and that on the mortgage deed, executed concurrently, but according to custom dated the following day, to the assignment, were in different handwritings. The two documents had been engrossed by two draftsmen, each of whom had added the abbreviated signature to the document he had engrossed. The purchase deed was considered the most valuable possession of the City of London Library; the mortgage deed one of the greatest treasures in the British Museum. Twenty years ago the authorities of these two great national libraries had been compelled to admit to him that either of the so-called signatures was, or pretended to be, a signature of William Shakespeare. That disposed of the signatures. The recent discovery of Dr. Wallace had not unearthed a signature of William Shakspere. The alleged signature was attached to certain "Answers to Interrogatories" made in a legal action then pending. If the deponent had been able to write he must have signed these answers in full without abbreviation. There was no escape from this pertinent fact. But as he was not able to write one letter of his own name he signed the "Answers to Interrogatories" with a round dot. Over this mark the law clerk had, with an extremely

rapid pen, written *Wilm Shaxpr*. Dr. Wallace misread this to be *Willm Shaks*, but he (the lecturer) understood that all the experts at the Record Office had been compelled to arrive at the conclusion that the true reading was *Wilm Shaxpr*.

The Portraits were next considered. There were only two which could be considered authentic, namely, the bust in Stratford Church and the Drosehout engraving prefixed to the 1623 first folio edition of the plays. The present monument was not the original monument or bust. "Antiquities of Warwickshire," by Sir William Dugdale, published in 1656, contained an engraving of the monument; it differed in nearly every detail from the present one, which was erected after Shakspere had been dead 120 years. Mrs. C. C. Stopes, who was not a Baconian, had pointed this out in an article in the *National Review* in 1904, and no man of intelligence had ventured to impugn her evidence, to dispute her facts, or to question her conclusions.

The only other "authentic" portrait was the Drosehout engraving. He had proved beyond cavil or question that this portrait was that of a mere dummy figure clothed in an impossible coat, cunningly composed of two left arms cleverly united together, surmounted by a putty-faced mask, which is totally unlike the face of any human being and which is furnished with an ear made like a cup to hide any real ear which might form part of any face behind the mask. No tailor could be found who would venture to assert that the coat depicted could be supposed to represent a real coat, or that by any possibility it could have been so drawn accidentally. The unfortunate man encased within a coat so made would be unable to use his right arm and would present a ridiculous appearance. Anyone possessing ordinarily good eyesight could see that the artist had portrayed a mask. He must see that there is a clearly-cut black line drawn round the edge of the mask. Thus had the engraver done out the life and hidden the face. This figure was purposely prepared to reveal the truth that William Shakespeare, of Stratford-on-Avon, Gentleman, was a mere mask, a left hand, a pseudonym of the great author Francis Bacon.

In Westminster Abbey was a medallion bust of Ben Jonson, in which he was represented as wearing a left-handed coat. In Seymour's Stowe, II., pp. 512, 513, there was a description of it, and the following lines, which were written concerning it, were quoted :—

> "O rare Ben Jonson—what a turn-coat grown !
> Thou ne'er wast such, till clad in stone.
> Then let not this disturb thy sprite,
> Another age shall set thy buttons right."

The design of the bust was not to dishonour Ben Jonson but to honour him by proclaiming him as the noblest, the truest, and the most trusted of Bacon's secret agents.

The lecture was illustrated by limelight lantern views. In a discussion which followed, Mrs. C. C. Stopes, who was present,

admitted that the signatures had to be surrended, but she contended that because the name of Shakspere had been written by the law clerks on the various documents, that fact did not preclude the possibility of his being able to write or necessarily imply his lack of education.

The lecture was attentively listened to by the appreciative audience, and a cordial vote of thanks was accorded to Sir Edwin on its conclusion.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—BACONIANA and I are such old acquaintances and fellow-workers that I deprecate any misunderstanding of our relative positions. And I fear that its editorial remarks upon page 106 of its April, 1910, issue will mislead readers unaware of our long comity.

But I have treated these constantly-recurring "ciphers" with patience and hospitality so long! And even a worm will turn!

My objection to them is (1) that they are not ciphers at all; (2) that even if they are ciphers, they are unnecessary; and (3) that they are already so numerous as to be impossible, not to say ridiculously impossible!

(1) A cipher implies a code; at least it implies A KEY. If Lord Bacon had proposed to leave a cipher to posterity he would (unless we are to abrogate our own sanity or our estimate of Lord Bacon's) have left posterity a KEY of that cipher. Having carefully concealed a message to posterity in a cipher, he would not have proceeded to carefully conceal the key of that cipher! We would not assign to the simplest Simon of men such a stultification as that! far much less to the man whom even his enemies conceded to be the wisest and brightest of mankind!

What these numerous gentlemen—from Mr. Donnelly to his twenty-first or twenty-second successor—have given us are not CIPHERS at all, but KEYS!! Having invented out of their own heads certain KEYS, they proceed to guess at a depository of the assumed "cipher," and then (with, however, much practice, adjustment, revision, experiment and what all, we can never know, for they do not propose to tell us) they proceed to apply it somewhere. Having induced it to work somewhere, they announce it and calmly challenge us to on the instant disprove something that they have themselves spent days or months or years in perfecting!

(2) But why are these ciphers necessary? Why resort to cryptic or adumbrant matter at all until we have exhausted our facts, or, if our facts, then until we have exhausted our stock-in-trade of possibilities, if not our probabilities? Or do we doubters propose to admit that our brief of facts is exploded, and that our stock of probabilities and of possibilities has gone by the board?

Otherwise, why reject arguments that appeal to all sane persons, and replace them with arguments that appeal to nobody or to a very few (except, perhaps, to their sense of the ridiculous)? The line of fact is the line of least resistance. Why abandon it in favour of a line of cryptic material that nobody but its inventors can conceive of, or comprehend when it has been conceived? Has any fact, rumour, or item of record turned up for the last one hundred years that is inconsistent with the Baconian authorship theory? If there has not, why invite the ridicule of the casual and the half-informed by recourse to the occult and the mysterious?

(3) As a matter of actual count, there are twenty-one "Baconian Ciphers" to date. Enumerating Mr. William Stone Booth's mediæval "Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon" as a "cipher" there are twenty-two.

A very cursory inspection of Mr. Booth's remarkable affair will show that any given name—"George Washington," "George the Third," "William Shakespeare," or "William Stone Booth," or any other—is as readily revealed by Mr. Booth's schedules as is any one of the seventy or eighty significances of Lord Bacon! Indeed, Mr. Booth himself, with a simplicity that is almost too sacred for profane comment, calls our attention to this facility of his system! He himself pathetically extracts the name "William Shakespeare." Why, after getting out the "WILLIAM S," he does not switch off to a T, instead of to an H, and so extract for us "WILLIAM STONE BOOTH" instead of WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, passeth man's understanding; unless it be that he is traitorously aware that, while William Stone Booth has never been accused of writing the Shakespeare plays, a certain William Shakespeare has been accused of that very crime; and here, by extracting that name three times, the crime is actually fixed upon him!

The one solitary exception to the above must be the cipher produced by Mrs. Gallup. In this Mrs. Gallup has had the wisdom to apply Lord Bacon's own code as described by himself in the "De Augmentis." I have not myself been able to verify her work; but other eyes have been more fortunate. A considerable feature of her work—which would lead me to expect much from it—is Mrs. Gallup's absolute good faith in making what lawyers call "a declaration against interest"; but, presenting those translations from the Homeric poems, of course they weaken the probabilities. But if they are where Mrs. Gallup says they are, to have suppressed them would have been such bad faith on her part as to have *à Poutrance* disposed of Mrs. Gallup and her cipher for ever!

Trusting that this very long letter, which has grown to its proportions through my effort to be brief (*Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio*), may not trespass unduly upon your pages,

I remain, with constant good wishes and goodwill,

Yours faithfully, APPLETON MORGAN.

Westfield, New Jersey, June 19, 1910.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I am not interested in defending any of the Baconian ciphers. They may stand on their own merits—if they have any—but I want to add a word to what you say in your April issue about Dr. Appleton Morgan's remarks in *New Shakespeareana* about ciphers. Dr. Morgan is my friend and I should not wish to say anything to hurt his feelings—but I really do not think there is much danger of that. He knows me too well. And he knows that I know that he is only fooling when he talks such nonsense as he did in February *New Shakespeareana* about ciphers. His talk about "Witches's Palindromes," etc., he knows as well as I do, as you do, Mr. Editor, that it is rank nonsense. The cipher—if there is any—has nothing whatever to do with Shakespeare's message to the human soul, nor to his references to current events. What is said in the text of Shakespeare has nothing whatever to do with any possible cipher which may have been put into it. If I should want to use Mr. Roosevelt's Guildhall speech, or his speech at Oxford, I could put a cipher into it easily enough without in the slightest degree disguising his views in regard to British rule in Egypt, or of the influence of history on current events. Suppose I want to say "*Cat*," what is easier than to underline the first "c," the next "a" and the subsequent "t"? It has not in the slightest degree disturbed Mr. Roosevelt's views in regard to the Egyptian policy, but *there is the cat*; that is, if I tell the printer to put those letters in a different type from the others. Is not Dr. Morgan aware that there is not a moment of the twenty-four hours that go to make up the three hundred and sixty-five days that make up a year of a modern century, that the bottom of the Atlantic is not kept hot by diplomatic dispatches flying back and forth in cipher? Witches's palindromes, forsooth!

ISAAC HULL PLATT.